



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,624	09/08/2003	Christopher Vitello	200207120-1	1542
22879	7590	06/08/2007	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			NGUYEN, TAI V	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			3729	
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/08/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/657,624	VITELLO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tai Van Nguyen	3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 8-10 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In regards to the merits of Silverbrook (US 6,247,792) in the previous Non Final Rejection filed 1/16/2007, the applicants' argument that Silverbrook does not teach the feature of that the step using a solvent to dissolving dissolve the at least the portion of the channel core from the element after solidifying the molten material.

Accordingly, the previous Non Final rejection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silverbrook (US 6,247,792) in view of DeBoer et al (US 6,345,880).

As applied to claims 1-3, Silverbrook disclose a method of creating an internal channel of a fluid-ejection device, the method comprising: encapsulating (column 5, lines 64-65) at least a portion of a channel core (19, 20, Fig 2) that corresponds to the internal channel in a molten material (50) of an element of the fluid-ejection device that corresponds to the internal channel (column 9, lines 49-54+); solidifying the molten material so that the at least the portion of the channel core is contained within the

element as molded plastic ink channels (19, 20); then used thermal expansion (CTE) and its high stiffness (see column 17, actuator mechanism).

However, Silverbrook does not discloses using a solvent to dissolving dissolve the at least the portion of the channel core from the element after solidifying the molten material.

DeBoer et al teaches using a solvent to dissolving dissolve the at least the portion of the channel core from the element after solidifying the molten material (see Example 2).

As applied to claim 4, Silverbrook disclose the composite channel core comprises a soluble material (18) and insoluble particles (19, 20) dispersed within the soluble material.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at this time the invention was made to have modified the method of Silverbrook by including by solvent, as taught by Deboer et al to positively provide the metal layer of print head as a strongly bonded (column 3, lines 22-25).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Claims 8-10 is allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art does not teach all of the limitations of the claimed invention including:

In claim 8: - after the molten material of the element of the fluid-ejection device solidifies within the mold cavity, removing the element of the fluid-ejection device from the mold while the at least the portion of the channel core is encapsulated by the solidified material of the element of the fluid-ejection device; and

- dissolving the at least the portion of the channel core that is encapsulated by the solidified material of the element of the fluid-ejection device after removing the element of the fluid-ejection device with the at least the portion of the channel core encapsulated thereby from the mold.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tai Van Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4567. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 A.M - 4:30 P.M).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TN. May 31, 2007



A. DEXTER TUGBANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER